

Appl. No. 10/709,027
Amdt. dated September 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 06, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-10, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 006746130B2 ("130").

5 Response:

According to the present application, claim 1 recites a liquid display device comprising a liquid crystal display panel having two parallel substrates and a liquid crystal layer sealed between the substrates, a light source for generating light beams, and a dispersion film positioned between the liquid crystal display panel and the light source having a plurality of bar-like structures arranged along a first direction and facing the light source, *wherein the dispersion film is utilized for enabling brightness of the light beams generated from the light source to be increased when a viewing angle is increased, and further utilized for enabling the liquid crystal display device to display an image with uniform brightness.* The applicant would like to point out that the light beams ejected from the dispersion film are scattered outwards, and therefore its brightness increases when the viewing angle increases. While the light transmittance of the liquid crystal display panel gets smaller as the viewing angle increases, the dispersion film compensates for the brightness of the light beams as the viewing angle increases. Therefore the liquid crystal display can obtain an image with uniform brightness at various viewing angles.

Appl. No. 10/709,027
Amdt. dated September 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 06, 2005

To the contrary, US 006746130B2 ("130") teaches a liquid crystal display panel LP, a light source element L, and a light control sheet 41 having projection rows. The light control sheet 41 is used to control the light from the light guide plate 1 so that the **widely distributing incident light beams are paralleled and emitted approximately toward the same desired direction, resulting an image looking bright as viewed from a certain direction**. Therefore, the cited prior art cannot resolve the unequal brightness problem when viewing the display panel from different angles.

10 Applicant therefore asserts that the present application is patentably distinct from 130, and can achieve an effect that 130 fails to expect. Reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested. Claims 5, 6, 8, and 10 are dependent on claim 1 and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 5, 6, 8, and 10 is politely requested.

15

Furthermore, claim 17 recites a liquid display device comprising a liquid crystal display panel having two parallel substrates and a liquid crystal layer sealed between the substrates; a light source for generating light beams; and a *dispersion film positioned between the liquid crystal display panel and the light source having a plurality of pyramid structures facing the light source, wherein the dispersion film is utilized for enabling brightness of the light beams generated from the light source to be increased when a viewing angle is increased, and further utilized for enabling the liquid crystal display device to display an image with uniform brightness*. On the other hand, the light control sheet with projection rows taught by 130 are used to **make the distributing incident light beams**

Appl. No. 10/709,027
Amdt. dated September 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 06, 2005

parallel and emit approximately toward the same desired direction. The applicant asserts that the structures and the functions are distinctly different from each other, and therefore reconsideration of claim 17 is respectfully requested. Claim 18 is dependent on claim 17 and should be 5 allowed if claim 17 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 18 is politely requested.

2. Allowable subject Matter

Claims 2-4, 7 and 19-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected 10 base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 11-16 are allowed.

15 Response:

As all dependent claims are dependent on claim 1 or claim 17, and should be allowed if claim 1 and claim 17 are allowed in the light of the explanation above. Claims 11-16 have been allowed.

20 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/709,027
Amdt. dated September 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 06, 2005

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: September 28, 2005

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)